

polls show literally billions of them want to come to America. Immigration is no longer a solution to the problems of the world. I would argue that the best gift the U.S. could give to the world would be to develop a sustainable, equitable, environmentally benign nation which could serve as an example of sustainability to the world.

Bottom line: Ask yourself what problem in America will be made better by continuing to add massive numbers of people? America before immigration "reform" averaged approximately 250,000 immigrants a year. If we would return to those historic numbers, we would take a great step toward leaving our children a sustainable America.

My candidacy, and the candidacy of some other people who I have never met, never talked to, and never heard of, caused consternation among some Sierra Club old-timers. For the record: I am not an animal rights activist, but rather a hunter and fisherman who goes fishing in Alaska on a regular basis. To those who charge that anyone interested in immigration limits is a racist let me say I organized the NAACP at the University of California and served

as its first Vice President. My first job out of law school was for the Colorado Anti-Discrimination Commission, and I have received numerous brotherhood awards. When we had no money, we paid for my wife to go to Selma for the Civil Rights March to show our support. Enough said.

It is time for a new vision for America and for the environment. We have to move toward sustainability and that means addressing the twin questions of consumption and population. The Sierra Club can no longer afford to run away from this issue. When the Statute of Liberty was erected we were a relatively empty continent in an uncrowded world. Now four billion people live below the U.S. welfare level (with 75 million more added each year) and dream of coming to America. How many can and should we accept? The problem will not go away by avoiding the issue. The world's eco-system does not need 300 million more consuming Americans, nor do we. Immigration has gone from a solution to a problem, and the sooner the public and the Sierra Club recognize this the better America we will leave our children and grandchildren. ■

I Have a Plan to Destroy America

And many parts of it are underway

by Richard D. Lamm

I have a secret plan to destroy America. If you believe, as many do, that America is too smug, too white bread, too self-satisfied, too rich, lets destroy America. It is not that hard to do. History shows that nations are more fragile than their citizens think. No

Richard D. Lamm, former governor of Colorado, currently directs the Center for Public Policy and Contemporary Issues at the University of Denver. He gave this brief talk at a meeting of the board of directors of FAIR, the Federation for American Immigration Reform, October 2003.

nation in history has survived the ravages of time. Arnold Toynbee observed that all great civilizations rise and they all fall, and that "An autopsy of history would show that all great nations commit suicide." Here is my plan:

I. We must first make America a bilingual- bicultural country. History shows, in my opinion, that no nation can survive the tension, conflict, and antagonism of two competing languages and cultures. It is a blessing for an individual to be bilingual; it is a curse for a society to be bilingual. One scholar, Seymour Martin Lipset, put it this way: The histories of bilingual and bicultural societies that do not assimilate are histories of turmoil, tension, and tragedy. Canada, Belgium,

Malaysia, Lebanon – all face crises of national existence in which minorities press for autonomy, if not independence. Pakistan and Cyprus have divided. Nigeria suppressed an ethnic rebellion. France faces difficulties with its Basques, Bretons, and Corsicans.

II. I would then invent “multiculturalism” and encourage immigrants to maintain their own culture. I would make it an article of belief

that all cultures are equal: that there are no cultural differences that are important. I would declare it an article of faith that the Black and Hispanic dropout rate is only due to prejudice and discrimination by the majority. Every other explanation is out-of-bounds.

III. We can make the United States a “Hispanic Quebec” without much effort. The key is to celebrate diversity rather than unity. As Benjamin Schwarz said in the *Atlantic Monthly* recently: “...the apparent success of our own multiethnic and multicultural experiment might have been achieved not by tolerance but by hegemony.” Without the dominance that once dictated ethnocentrically, and what it meant to be an American, we are left with only tolerance and pluralism to hold us together. I would encourage all immigrants to keep their own language and culture. I would replace the melting pot metaphor with a salad bowl metaphor. It is important to insure that we have various cultural sub-groups living in America reinforcing their differences rather than as Americans, emphasizing their similarities.

IV. Having done all this, I would make our fastest growing demographic group the least educated – I would add a second underclass, unassimilated, undereducated, and antagonistic to our population. I would have this second underclass have a 50 percent drop out rate from school.

V. I would then get the big foundations and big business to give these efforts lots of money. I would invest in ethnic identity, and I would establish the cult of Victimology. I would get all minorities to think their lack of success was all the fault of the majority – I would start a grievance industry blaming all minority failure on the majority population.

***“We can make the
U.S. a ‘Hispanic
Quebec’ without
much effort.”***

VI. I would establish dual citizenship and promote divided loyalties. I would “celebrate diversity.” “Diversity” is a wonderfully seductive word. It stresses

differences rather than commonalities. Diverse people worldwide are mostly engaged in hating each other – that is, when they are not killing each other. A diverse, peaceful, or stable society is against most historical precedent. People undervalue the unity it takes to keep a nation

together, and we can take advantage of this myopia. Look at the ancient Greeks. Dorf’s *World History* tells us: “The Greeks believed that they belonged to the same race; they possessed a common language and literature; and they worshiped the same gods. All Greece took part in the Olympic games in honor of Zeus and all Greeks venerated the shrine of Apollo at Delphi. A common enemy Persia threatened their liberty. Yet, all of these bonds together were not strong enough to overcome two factors...” (local patriotism and geographical conditions that nurtured political divisions...). If we can put the emphasis on the “Pluribus,” instead of the “Unum,” we can balkanize America as surely as Kosovo.

VII. Then I would place all these subjects off limits – make it taboo to talk about. I would find a word similar to “heretic” in the 16th century – a word that stops discussion and paralyzes thinking – a word like “racist” or “xenophobe” that halts argument and conversation. Having made America a bilingual-bicultural country, having established multiculturalism, having the large foundations fund the doctrine of “victimology,” I would next make it impossible to enforce our immigration laws. I would develop a mantra – “that because immigration has been good for America, it must always be good.” I would make every individual immigrant sympatric and ignore the cumulative impact.

VIII. Lastly, I would censor Victor Hanson Davis’s book, *Mexifornia*. This book is dangerous – it exposes my plan to destroy America. So please, please – if you feel that America deserves to be destroyed – please, please, don’t buy this book! This guy is on to my plan.

Peace 2010

A look backward from the future

by Richard D. Lamm

[Richard Lamm wrote a prize winning essay for the "Peace 2010" contest sponsored by The Christian Science Monitor in 1995. The invitation was to write an essay from the point of view of someone in the year 2010 telling how peace had been established among the nations of the world. Lamm pretended his essay was an excerpt from a book entitled A History of the Twentieth Century written by someone named Cornelius Barnes.]

"Against our will comes wisdom."
— Aeschylus

"When we released the energy from the atom, everything changed except our way of thinking. Because of that, we drift toward unparalleled disaster. We shall require a substantially new manner of thinking if mankind is to survive." — Albert Einstein

Albert Einstein's prophetic words foreshadowed The Time of Peace: 1994 was the year of the ultimate war and the year that a lasting peace finally arrived on earth.

History shows periods of peace to be the exception rather than the rule. Since the dawn of history, neighbor has fought neighbor; tribe has fought tribe; religion has

fought religion; nation has fought nation. The history of man is partially written in blood: construction giving way to destruction; peace and stability turning into war and chaos. Wars have been as inevitable to history as storms are to weather.

Violence and terrorism increased dramatically as the 20th century, already history's most destructive century, lurched to a close. In the 1970s and 1980s, violence seemed to reach a crescendo. By the late 1980s, Russia and the United States both instituted "launch on warning" nuclear systems. A myriad of local wars, revolutions, incidents of religious and sectarian strife, terrorism, and random acts of violence were made even more frightening by the rapid growth of the nuclear club. Peace was a stranger. Man seemed to have lost his capacity for shock, inundated as he was — wherever he lived — by daily news bulletins and TV reports of wars, terrorism, and violence.

One American wit, Woody Allen, seemed to sum up the dilemma: "More than any other time in history, mankind faces the crossroads ...one path leads to despair and utter hopelessness, the other to total extinction. I pray we have the wisdom to choose wisely."

The flash point came, with history's usual irony, in the least

expected place. Although India and Pakistan had fought three wars (1947, 1965, and 1971), an uneasy truce had existed between them. Despite their legacy of hate and distrust, no significant increase in tensions is known to have preceded the devastating nuclear exchange. None of history's usual causations seemed to trigger the conflagration: no jihad, no territorial dispute, no recent reason for revenge. History's most bloody war was apparently caused by some minor miscalculation. Like the War of Jenkins' Ear, the cause, while lost in the radiated ashes, was so insignificant as to conjure up Hannah Arendt's phrase, "the banality of evil." No international threat or declaration from either country harbingered the holocaust. It just happened.

The morning of November 29, 1994, dawned clear and cool over the Indian subcontinent. The harvests had been sparse, but adequate. The border between India and Pakistan, long filled with minor incidents, had been exceptionally quiet.

Granted, the religious differences were as strong as ever, but no known incident or aggravation was present. November 29th was so like so many similar days — alive with pungent smells, buzzing women on the way to market, mischievous children, men

Richard D. Lamm, former governor of Colorado, currently directs the Center for Public Policy and Contemporary Issues at the University of Denver.